

HTA Design LLP
78 Chamber Street, London E1 8BL

020 7485 8555
info@hta.co.uk
www.hta.co.uk



Comments on Conditions (10, 11 and 14) at 51-65 Wensley Road Garages

Site	51-65 Wensley Road Garages
Reference Number	-
Date Comments Provided	24/05/2022
Date Response Provided	24/06/2022
Issue:	2

Item	Comment from Sarah Hanson / Jonathan Markwell	Applicant Response
Condition 10		
1.	RBC-CGR_HTA-L_XX_DR_1900 Rev B Hard Landscape GA (referred to by hta a 'hard landscape finishes') –this plan now makes reference to, and shows, the areas of no-dig surfacing (as per the approved TPP, Phase 2). I note the mammal gaps, which are still confined to the northern perimeters and also note that 'timber fence' (with ref to the key) is confirmed as only proposed on one short length on the southern boundary. However, this seems at odds with hta's response to my comments in which they say: 'As a result of level differences between the garage site and private rear gardens, consideration has been given to only locate the mammal gaps where the levels will allow and where fencing is being replaced', and also that: 'The extent of new fencing is correct; all other boundaries are being retained'. The response indicates that the mammal gaps are on the northern perimeter, partly due to fencing being replaced there, but the response also indicates that the fencing is not being replaced here. You may wish to clarify. In any case I note the reason for the omission of gaps on the south side. With regard to the proposed bat and bird boxes – I don't think GS Ecology's email of 12/5/22 or memo of 23/5/22 commented on these?	HTA – LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Mammal gaps are only possible in the locations shown. Discussions have been had with neighbouring properties about implementing additional mammal gaps in existing boundaries and been met with resistance. The new fence is to sit in front of the existing fences to private gardens, as such mammal gaps would not be achievable in the new fence line. As such these have been removed from the proposed fence detail and provided as a separate product image. The Extent of fencing to be replaced is correct as per Landscape GA 1900



2.	I note the Engineers plans (as listed above) now submitted which are largely acceptable. The only query would be the levels which don't appear to show the increase as a result of the no-dig Cellweb areas (200m + deep on Road Construction Details drawing). I note this is accounted for within the RPA of the off-site Walnut (T1 of AMS) by the assumption of the existing concrete slab being 200mm deep, but the increase in level under the on-site tree (T2 of AMS) does not appear to be shown?	JNP RESPONSE: In this RPA, the 200m slab has been proposed to be removed to allow for the cell-web no-dig construction. Also, the proposed levels are constrained by the existing access situated at the back of parking bays, which is why we have not raised the levels in this area.
3.	RBC-CGR_HTA-L_XX_DR_1902 Rev B Planting Plan (Soft) – I previously queried why one of the trees was in a different place to that shown during the application process and a satisfactory explanation for this has been provided. I also requested that one of the trees was changed to a different species to increase diversity (one Tree Strategy aim) to which hta responded: 'This type of tree was specifically chosen due to its suitability for the site. Sorbus was chosen as they tend to be quite upright when young and can then spread out once above the height of the garages. As such a view was taken to only include this type of tree for this site'. This response indicates other Sorbus, which includes other species, might also be suitable hence an alternative Sorbus should be considered for one of the trees.	HTA – LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: 1 no Sorbus aucuparia added instead of Sorbus aria.
4.	I previously questioned the space (width) and stem clearance of the proposed trees to avoid conflict. Hta's responses are satisfactory, albeit I'm not 100% convinced that the tree on the west end of the long garage block has sufficient space. In relation to tree pit design, this is shown on RBC-CGR-HTA-L_XX-DR_8900 Rev A Typical details but there are two issues with this: 1) it refers to a 16-18cm girth tree when the Planting Plan includes 18-20cm girth and 2) no mulch is specified to be consistent with the Soiling plan.	HTA – LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Detail updated as per the comments
5.	RBC-CGR_HTA-L_XX_DR_1901 Rev B Soiling plan (Soft) – I previously raised inconsistencies between the key and plan and compared to the Planting Plan. The revised soiling plan is still not consistent in that it indicates that there is no shrub planting under the two trees, whereas this is proposed.	HTA – LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: The soiling plan shows the depth of soil profile, In the areas where trees as proposed the soiling has been shown at a suitable depth to allow trees. That does not preclude the planting of shrubs it just means a deeper soil profile is need overall to allow suitable volume for the tree. Where only shrubs are proposed a shallower soil profile can be specified.

—
HTA Design LLP
78 Chamber Street, London E1 8BL

—
020 7485 8555
info@hta.co.uk
www.hta.co.uk



6.	RBC-CGR_HTA-L_XX_DR_8900 Typical Details Rev B – I note this now shows the mammal gaps size but again is not consistent with other submitted details in that it indicates gaps in new fencing when Hard Landscape GA plan only indicated new fencing on the south side where no gaps are proposed (comments above).	HTA – LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Detail removed from proposed fence detail.
7.	RBC-CGR_HTA-L_XX_SC_1700 Rev A dated 11.05.22 Maintenance Strategy & Schedule – this now acceptable.	Noted.
8.	Provision of commentary to explain the permeability of the build-up (I would point you towards pages 392-393 of the SuDS manual for the type / nature of visual information to be provided). Up to this point it had been assumed that it would be fully permeable, so your clarifications would be welcomed.”	GLENMAN COMMENTS: The proposed road construction is fully permeable (Type A – Total Infiltration – Pg 392 – SuDs manual) and therefore the SW run-off infiltrates through the ground. The current surface construction of this area is concrete, whereby the runoff currently flows into the grassed areas. However, by making the proposed parking area fully porous, we are improving the infiltration aspect of this current parking area by enabling the SW to run through the surface rather than accumulating any standing water or additional flows running off the surface, which currently occurs.
Condition 11		
9.	Comments above apply in relation to inconsistencies. Clarification required.	HTA – LANDSCAPE COMMENTS: Extent of proposed and existing fencing as per GA 1900.